

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
VALDOSTA DIVISION**

| | | |
|----------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| DAWN WOOTEN, | : | |
| | : | |
| Plaintiff, | : | |
| v. | : | CASE NO.: 7:22-CV-00148 (WLS) |
| | : | |
| LASALLE SOUTHEAST LLC, and | : | |
| DAVID PAULK, | : | |
| | : | |
| Defendants. | : | |
| | : | |

ORDER

Defendants move for a protective order allowing the Parties to designate certain discovery materials confidential. (Doc. 94 at 1.) Yet Defendants' failure to attach a proposed order in their initial filing may have prevented Plaintiff Dawn Wooten from responding to the final Proposed Order (Doc. 99-1). So the Court gives her the opportunity to amend her Response, if she wishes to.

Defendants' Motion refers to a proposed protective order, which they fail to attach. (Doc. 94 at 1.) Even so, Wooten's Response refers to a proposed order. (Doc. 96 at 3.) From the emails attached to Defendants' Motion, it appears that Wooten's Counsel received a proposed order from Defense Counsel by email, even if it wasn't filed as an exhibit to the initial Motion. (*See* Doc. 94-2 at 1-3; Doc. 94-4 at 1-2; Doc. 96 at 3.) In Defendants' Reply they now attach a Proposed Order. (Doc. 99-1.)

This presents a problem: because the Proposed Order (Doc. 99-1) was attached to the Reply, Wooten hasn't had an opportunity to respond—at least in the form filed on the docket. Of course, it may be the same as the proposed order emailed between Counsel. But the attachments to those emails are not part of the record. So were the Court to enter the Proposed Protective Order (Doc. 99-1), Wooten might not have had the opportunity to respond. In other words, there is no guarantee that the proposed order exchanged between Counsel is the same as the Proposed Order (Doc. 99-1) attached to Defendants' Reply.

To ensure that Wooten has a full opportunity to respond to the final text of the Proposed Order, the Court will give her the opportunity to amend her Response. Wooten may amend, if she chooses, no later than **Monday, August 4, 2025**. If Wooten chooses not to, the Court will assume that the proposed order referenced in her Response is the same as the Proposed Order (Doc. 99-1) attached to Defendants' Reply, and that she has no further objection to it beyond those arguments already raised. If Wooten amends her Response, Defendants must file their reply, if necessary, no later than **seven days** after her amendment.

SO ORDERED, this 21st day of July 2025.

/s/ W. Louis Sands
W. LOUIS SANDS, SR. JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT